

Remarks:

Claims 1-6 and 8 are in the application, of which claim 1 is in independent form. Claim 7 is cancelled by this amendment.

The Examiner requests pertinent references describing the AppianDX technology. Applicant responds by submitting the enclosed Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (“SIDS”), accompanying PTO form-1449, and reference entitled “AppianDX: A Solution for DirectX Display Across Multiple Monitors” (“the reference”). The relevance of the reference is described in §5 of the SIDS. The AppianDX source code listing, which is a CDROM Appendix to the application, and the reference are currently the only known documents describing the AppianDX software product.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2 for indefiniteness. The Examiner states that “the direct driver” lacks antecedent basis. Applicant responds by amending claim 5 to recite, “the direct access driver...”

Claims 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Examiner states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant responds by amending independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 7, canceling claim 7, and amending claim 8 to depend from claim 1.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for obviousness over various combinations of US Pat. Nos. 5,835,090 of Clark et al., 6,510,470 of Capelli, and 6,411,302 of Chiraz. Applicant believes that this rejection is rendered moot by the above-described amendment of claim 1 to recite the allowable subject matter of claim 7.

Applicant believes his application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom C. Martyn

By *Richard B. Preiss*
Richard B. Preiss
Registration No. 36,640

STOEL RIVES LLP
900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600
Portland, Oregon 97204-1268
Telephone: (503) 224-3380
Facsimile: (503) 220-2480
Attorney Docket No. 53264/1:1